UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/730,735	12/08/2003	Sohail Baig Mohammed	MS1-1724US	3970

22801   7590   09/22/2009
LEE & HAYES, PLLC
601 W. RIVERSIDE AVENUE
SUITE 1400
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER
QUELER, ADAM M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
09/22/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhptoms@leehayes.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/730,735	MOHAMMED ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	ADAM M. QUELER	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 August 2009*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-107* is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) *91-107* is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-90* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *08 December 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date *See Continuation Sheet*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :12/8/2003, 5/14/2004, 6/6/2007, 8/29/2007, 12/27/2007, 2/29/2008, 5/15/2008, 7/23/2008, 11/17/2008, 1/21/2009, 3/30/2009, 4/30/2009, 8/4/2009, .

DETAILED ACTION

1.　　　This action is responsive to communications: Application filed December 08, 2003,

Election filed 08/17/2009, and IDS's filed 12/8/2003, 5/14/2004, 6/6/2007, 8/29/2007,

12/27/2007, 2/29/2008, 5/15/2008, 7/23/2008, 11/17/2008, 1/21/2009, 3/30/2009, 4/30/2009, and

8/4/2009.

2.　　　Claims 1-107 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 15, 49, 73, and 77 are elected

independent claims.

Election/Restrictions

3.　　　Applicant's election of Group I in the reply filed on 8/17/2009 is acknowledged.

Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the

restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP

§ 818.03(a)).

4.　　　Claims 91-103 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as

being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 8/17/2009.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.　　　The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

6.　　　**Claims 1-9,14,49-51,53-64 and 69-76 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being**

anticipated by Taymans, Wim, et al, GStreamer Application Development Manual

(4/5/2003). GStreamer Core Reference Manual, GstEvent (4/29/2003) is cited as evidence

regarding Taymans.

Regarding independent claim(s) 1, Taymans discloses an a media engine (GStreamer)
embodied on the one or more computer-readable media and configured to communicatively
interact with an application to present a presentation (p. 5, bullet 2); the media engine being
configured to use: one or more media sources individual ones of which serving as a source of
media content (source elements, p. 9); one or more transforms communicatively linked with the
one or more media sources and configured to operate on data received from the one or more
media sources (filters and codecs, p. 9); and one or more media sinks configured to sink a media
stream (sink elements, p. 10).

Regarding independent claim(s) 49, Taymans teaches: a system comprising: one or more
computer-readable media; a media engine (GStreamer) embodied on the one or more computer-
readable media and configured to communicatively interact with an application to present a
presentation; the media engine being configured to use a media session (bin, Chapter 9); the
media session being configured to use: one or more media sources individual ones of which
serving as a source of media content (source elements, p. 9); one or more transforms
communicatively linked with the one or more media sources and configured to operate on data
received from the one or more media sources (filters and codecs, p. 9); and one or more media
sinks configured to sink a media stream (sink elements, p. 10).

Regarding independent claim(s) 73, Taymans teaches: a media engine (GStreamer) embodied
on the one or more computer-readable media and configured to communicatively interact with an
application to present a presentation; the media engine being configured to use a media
session(bin, Chapter 9); the media session being configured to use at least one media processor
(another bin, p. 23, para. 1), one or more bit pumps communicatively linked with the media

processor (pads, Chap. 7), a one or more media sources individual ones of which serving as a source of media content (source elements, p. 9); one or more transforms communicatively linked with the one or more media sources and configured to operate on data received from the one or more media sources (filters and codecs, p. 9); and one or more media sinks configured to sink a media stream (sink elements, p. 10).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 2, 50, Taymans discloses media engine exposes an application program interface that is used by an application to interact directly with the media engine, and indirectly with components used by the media engine (this appears to be the entire point of the reference, see pp. 3-6).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 3, 51, Taymans teaches destination associated with the media engine and configured to provide one or more media sinks (sink elements, p. 10).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 4, Taymans teaches the media engine is configured to provide support for both linear (mp3, p.11) and non-linear (AVI, p. 10) media sources.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 5, Taymans teaches the media engine is configured to provide transport control for the media content (p. 34, the httpsrc element handles network streaming which includes transport).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 6, Taymans teaches the media engine is configured to provide for asynchronous building and management of a media pipeline given a source of media content (p. 65, para. 2 in "Creating…").

Regarding dependent claim(s) 7, Taymans teaches the media engine is configured to provide source resolution (p. 57).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 8, Taymans teaches the media engine is configured to provide

access to at least some of its used components (p. 7, initializing provides the access).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 9, Taymans teaches the media engine the media engine is

configured to enable adjustment of a media processing pipeline configuration (p. 51).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 14, 72, 76, Taymans discloses the media engine is configured to

present a presentation on a computing device that is remote from a computing device on which

the media engine resides (httpsrc, p. 34).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 53, Taymans teaches receive information from the media

engine, said information being associated with (a) media content that is to be the subject of a

presentation, and (b) a destination that is configured to provide one or more media sinks

(capabilities, p. 17), and cause the media content to be presented (p. 23, para. 3)

Regarding dependent claim(s) 54, Taymans teaches the media session is configured to manage

data flow from said one or more media sources to said one or more media sinks (p. 23, para. 3).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 55, Taymans teaches media session exposes one or more

methods that enable the media engine to configure the media session for a presentation (p. 23,

para. 3).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 56, Taymans teaches media session exposes one or more

methods that enable the media engine to configure the media session for a presentation, wherein

one method comprises a method through which a topology on the media session is initialized (p.

23, para. 3, p. 25).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 57, 71, Taymans teaches media session exposes one or more

methods that enable the media engine to configure the media session for a presentation (p. 23,

para. 3).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 58, Taymans is configured to provide methods to start, stop and

pause a presentation (Chapter 11).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 59, Taymans teaches preroll method that is used by the media

engine to notify the media session to prepare for the start of a presentation (ready state, p. 29).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 60, Taymans teaches a plurality of information methods that can

be used by the application to obtain information that pertains to the session (p. 11, bottom

section).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 61, Taymans comprises a plurality of information methods that

can be used by the media engine to obtain information from the media session, wherein one

information method enables the media engine to ascertain a globally unique identifier that is

associated with a particular implementation of a media session (p. 11, an object can a unique

name, and can be accessed as a property).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 62, Taymans teaches one of the information methods enables

the application to ascertain multiple capabilities of the session (p. 17).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 63, 64, Taymans teaches to generate (set a state, Chap. 11) and

send an event to an engine associated with each of said start, stop and pause methods (p. 47,

schedulers monitor the state).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 69, 70, GCRM is cited as evidence that Taymans teaches an

event is rate change (p. 5, `GST_EVENT_RATE`).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 74, Taymans teaches or more bit pumps are configured to pull

data from the media processor (pad_pull (), p. 43).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 75, Taymans teaches one or more bit pumps are configured to

pull data from the media processor and to push pulled data to one or more media sinks (p. 43).

7.   **Claims 77-82,85,86 and 88-90 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated**

by Thompson, Chris, "DirectShow For Media Playback In Windows" Parts 1-3, Last part

dated 9/13/2000.

Regarding independent claim(s) 77, Thompson teaches a media engine embodied on the one or

more computer-readable media and configured to communicatively interact with an application

to present a presentation; the media engine being configured to use: one or more media sources

individual ones of which serving as a source of media content (p.2, source filter; one or more

transforms communicatively linked with one or more media sources and configured to operate

on data received from the one or more media sources (transform filter, p.2); and one or more

media sinks configured to sink a media stream (p. 2, render filter); the media engine further

being configured to first partially resolve a topology that is to be utilized to present the

presentation (p. 17, create first filters), and then cause a full topology to be resolved and

activated (p. 17, render an output pin).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 78, Thompson discloses a session (graph builder, p. 11).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 79, Thompson discloses wherein the media session is configured

to fully resolve said partial topology by at least ascertaining transforms that are to be placed

between the media sources and the media sinks (p. 9-10).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 80, Thompson discloses wherein the media engine is configured to receive calls from the application and forward the calls to the media session, said calls comprising calls to start, stop and pause the presentation (graph states, pp. 8-9).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 81, Thompson discloses the media session is configured to create a media processor that uses one or more media sources and one or more transforms (the graph, p. 1).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 82, Thompson discloses the media session is configured to create a media processor that uses one or more media sources and one or more transforms, wherein the media session is configured to set a topology on the media processor (pp. 9-10).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 85, Thompson teaches wherein the media session is configured to receive calls from the media processor to at least start, stop and pause the presentation (graph states, pp. 8-9).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 86, Thompson teaches the media session is configured to receive calls from the media processor to at least start, stop and pause the presentation (graph states, pp. 8-9)., wherein the media session is configured to send events to the media engine associated with calls that the media session receives from the media engine (p. 6).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 88, Thompson teaches the media session is configured to validate one or more component that handles data of the presentation (determining the filter can handle the data, pp. 9-10).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 89, Thompson teaches the media engine partially resolves said topology by at least determining one or more media sources and one or more media sinks for the presentation (pp. 9-10).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 90, Thompson teaches the media engine is configured to present

a presentation on a computing device that is remote from a computing device on which the media

engine resides (p. 17, file source is a URL).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

9.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c)

and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10.   **Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taymans.**

Regarding dependent claim(s) 52, Taymans does not explicitly disclose components that are no

visible to the application or media engine. Official Notice is taken that it was well-known for

objects such as bins to have private members that are not visible to other objects for the purpose

of encapsulation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to have such components because it would have enabled good programming by

encapsulation.

11.   Claim 87 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 87, Thompson does not disclose prerolling. Official Notice is

taken that it was well-known to reduce glitches associated with a presentation by prerolling

media data samples. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention to preroll as it would reduce glitches.

12.   Claims 10-13,15-36,41,43,47 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Taymans, and further in view of Blome, Michael et al. "Core Media

Technology in Windows XP Empowers You to Create Custom Audio/Video Processing

Components" (7/2002). "IFileSourceFilter Interface", hereinafter MSDN, is cited as

evidence regarding Blome.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 10-13, Taymans does not expressly disclose the stream selection

modes. Blome discloses a media engine with two modes where either the application of the

engine (application or FGM, p. 5, para. 5) selects which media streams (format of the data) are

used (§ "The Connection Protocol", p. 5, specifying which two pins should attempt to connect,

they must agree on the media type which is a type of stream).   It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the stream selection of

Blome in Taymans as it would provide flexibility of selection to a similar media engine in

Taymans.

Regarding independent claim(s) 15, Taymans discloses a media engine embodied on the one or

more computer-readable media and configured to communicatively interact with an application

to present a presentation (p. 5, bullet 2); the media engine being configured to use: one or more

media sources individual ones of which serving as a source of media content (source elements, p.

9); one or more transforms communicatively linked with the one or more media sources and

configured to operate on data received from the one or more media sources (filters and codecs, p.

9); and one or more media sinks configured to sink a media stream (sink elements, p. 10).

Taymans does not explicitly disclose a plurality of open methods. Blome discloses a similar

media engine that calls a RenderFile method (p .3, paragraphs describing Figs. 1 and 2). MSDN

is cited as evidence that such a call calls one multiple open methods that are part of a media

engine that can be called by an application to specify data sources in different manners (MSDN

shows that RenderFile calls Load for a particular type of source filter). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the functionality of

RenderFile in Taymans because it packs a lot of functionality into one call (p. 3, para. describing

Fig. 2).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 16, 35, GCRM is cited as evidence that Taymans was

configured to send events associated with a media presentation to an application (p. 4,

description).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 17, 19, 20, 22, Taymans does not explicitly disclose a plurality

of open methods. Blome discloses a similar media engine that calls a RenderFile method (p .3,

paragraphs describing Figs. 1 and 2). MSDN is cited as evidence that such a call calls one

multiple open methods that are part of a media engine that can be called by an application to

specify data sources in different manners (MSDN shows that RenderFile calls Load for a

particular type of source filter, including a URL, which is an object that media, which is a

bytestream can be obtained by). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at

the time of the invention to use the functionality of RenderFile in Taymans because it packs a lot

of functionality into one call (p. 3, para. describing Fig. 2).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 18, Taymans does not explicitly disclose a plurality of open

methods. Blome discloses a similar media engine that calls a RenderFile method (p .3,

paragraphs describing Figs. 1 and 2). Blome teaches the media source is created by the

application (Fig. 4, "`pGraph->AddFilter(pCapture, L"CaptureFilter");`"). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the

functionality of RenderFile in Taymans because it packs a lot of functionality into one call (p. 3,

para. describing Fig. 2).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 21, 22, Taymans discloses an open method that specifies a

topology to be used (p. 33, "pipeline" is specified in the iterate method).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 23, Taymans is configured to provide methods to start, stop and

pause a presentation (Chapter 11).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 24, Taymans teaches to generate (set a state, Chap. 11) and send

an event to an application associated with each of said start, stop and pause methods (p. 47,

schedulers monitor the state).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 25, Taymans teaches a plurality of information methods that can

be used by the application to obtain information that pertains to the presentation (p. 11, bottom

section).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 26, Taymans teaches one of the information methods enables

the application to be exposed to multiple capabilities of the media engine (p. 17).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 27, Taymans teaches one of the information methods enables

the application to ascertain when the system's capabilities change (Chapter 27).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 28, Taymans teaches an information method that enables the

application to obtain metadata associated with the presentation (Chapter 11).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 29, Taymans does not teach a property store. Official Notice is

taken that a property store was a well-known desired way to exchange metadata. It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a property store

for that reason.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 30, Taymans teaches one of the information methods enables

the application to ascertain a current destination (p. 17, properties of a pad which is a

destination).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 31, 32, Taymans teaches one of the information methods

enables the application to ascertain statistics associated with the media engine (Chap. 11, states

are statistics).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 33, 34, Taymans teaches retrieving a clock (p. 47, bullet 4).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 36, GCRM is cited as evidence that Taymans teaches an event

associated with he new presentation (p. 5, GST_EVENT_NEW_MEDIA).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 41, GCRM is cited as evidence that Taymans teaches an event

rendering of a last data sample from an active media source (p. 5, GST_EVENT_EOS).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 43, GCRM is cited as evidence that Taymans teaches an event is

associated with a switch between presentations (p. 5, GST_EVENT_NEW_MEDIA).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 47, GCRM is cited as evidence that Taymans teaches an event is

rate change (p. 5, `GST_EVENT_RATE`).

Regarding dependent claim(s) 48, Taymans discloses the media engine is configured to present

a presentation on a computing device that is remote from a computing device on which the media

engine resides (httpsrc, p. 34).

13.   **Claims 37-40,42 and 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Taymans and Blome as applied to claim 35 above, and further in view of

"EvCode.h", hereinafter Smith.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 37, Taymans and Blome do not teach an event associated with a

completion of an open method. Smith discloses events for a media engine including an event

associated with a completion of an open method (pp. 2-3, EC_OPENING_FILE). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the events of

Smith as it would have provide more control over the presentation.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 38, the above combination does not teach an event is associated

with completion of an operation begun by calling a start method on the media engine. Smith

discloses events for a media engine including completion of an operation begun by calling a start

method on the media engine (p. 3, EC_STREAM_CONTROL_STARTED). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the events of Smith

as it would have provide more control over the presentation.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 39, 42, the above combination does not teach an event is

associated with completion of an operation begun by calling a stop method on the media engine.

Smith discloses events for a media engine including an event associated with completion of an

operation begun by calling a stop method on the media engine (p. 3,

EC_STREAM_CONTROL_STOPPED). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to use the events of Smith as it would have provide more

control over the presentation.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 40, the above combination does not teach an event is associated

with completion of an operation begun by calling a pause method on the media engine. Smith

discloses events for a media engine including an event is associated with completion of an

operation begun by calling a pause method on the media engine (p. 2, EC_PAUSED). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the events

of Smith as it would have provide more control over the presentation.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 44, the above combination does not teach an event is associated

with a presentation destination change. Smith discloses events for a media engine including an

event is associated with a presentation destination change (p. 3, EC_DISPLAY_CHANGED). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the

events of Smith as it would have provide more control over the presentation.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 45, the above combination does not teach an event is associated

with a state change on the media engine. Smith discloses events for a media engine including an

event is associated with a state change on the media engine (p. 4, EC_STATE_CHANGE). It

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the

events of Smith as it would have provide more control over the presentation.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 46, the above combination does not teach an event is associated

with a change in a set of allowed operations on the media engine. Smith discloses events for a

media engine including an event is associated with a change in a set of allowed operations on the media engine (p. 4, EC_EXTDEVICE_MODE_CHANGE). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the events of Smith as it would have provide more control over the presentation.

14.   Claims 65-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taymans as applied to claim 49 above, and further in view of "EvCode.h", hereinafter Smith.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 65, the above combination does not teach an event is associated with session start. Smith discloses events for a media engine including completion of a session start (p. 3, EC_STREAM_CONTROL_STARTED). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the events of Smith as it would have provide more control over the presentation.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 66, 67, the above combination does not teach an event is associated with a session stop. Smith discloses events for a media engine including an event associated with a session stop (p. 3, EC_STREAM_CONTROL_STOPPED). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the events of Smith as it would have provide more control over the presentation.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 68, the above combination does not teach an event is associated with a session pause. Smith discloses events for a media engine including an event is associated with a session pause (p. 2, EC_PAUSED). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the events of Smith as it would have provide more control over the presentation.

15.   Claims 83 and 84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Thompson as applied to claim 78 above, and further in view of Blome.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 83, Thompson does not disclose time sources. Blome discloses

wherein the media session is configured to make determinations as to which time sources are to

be used to drive the presentation (p. 6, para, below Fig. 7). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Thompson and Blome because

they dealt with the same engine.

Regarding dependent claim(s) 84, Thompson does not disclose preventing drift. Blome

teaches the media session is configured to prevent drift between a rate of media sources and a

rate of a time source being used in live scenarios (p. 6, para, below Fig. 7). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Thompson and

Blome because they dealt with the same engine.

Conclusion

16.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

17.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to ADAM M. QUELER whose telephone number is (571)272-4140.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Adam M Queler/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178